UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

A Matter of Importance

By FRANCIS NEILSON

A New Way to Abolish War

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Outlawry of War

By SALMON O. LEVINSON

Unarmed and Unafraid

A HYMN OF PEACE

By DAVID STARR JORDAN

VOLUME LXXXVIII NUMBER 16

Chicago, December 29, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SIDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch
(*To be enlarged*)

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 243
A Matter of Importance.—FRANCIS NEILSON.. 245
A New Way to Abolish War.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 247

ARTICLES—

Outlawry of War.—SALMON O. LEVINSON.... 249
Some Recent Phases of the Peace Movement in Japan.—*David Starr Jordan*..... 253
The World's Great Rebels and Heretics. II. Amos the Farmer-Prophet.—ROLAND D. SAWYER 254

POETRY—

Unarmed and Unafraid.—DAVID STARR JORDAN 243
Second Sight.—*Zona Gale*..... 248
Afterwards.—JAMES WALDO FAWCETT..... 254

THE FIELD—

Free the Political Prisoners!..... 255

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVIII. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1921 NUMBER 16

UNARMED AND UNAFRAID.

A Hymn of Peace.

O thou blest land, America!
I look adown thy country side,
And in the dawning glow of Peace,
I see thy landscape glorified.

Thy forests loftier rear their crests
Thine eager rivers swifter flow,
While from thy hills of Hope and Faith
Thy cleansing winds of Freedom blow.

The future beckons—may it be
The land where every dream comes true,
The land in which each humblest child
Shall breathe as free as I or you.

The favored land of noble youth,
The land where Hatred dies away,
The land where each may know the truth,
The chosen land of Liberty.

Erect, unarmed and unafraid
Its children of the future stand
With Peace, her sheltering pinions spread
North, South, East, West, above our land.

O speed the day when blood of man
No more incarnadines the sod,
When man in brotherhood shall stand
With every child a son of God.

When Peace with velvet-sandalled feet
Shall tread the land from shore to shore
And peoples in the bond of love
Shall never learn war any more.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

One of the greatest values which come from Peace Conferences, and from all public discussions of Peace problems, is the revelation of the public will and hope. No one could listen to the "voices in the air" at the time of the calling of the Versailles meeting or hear the thundering of press, pulpit and rostrum at the present time without knowing where the heart of the plain people lies. From every street-corner and fireside there arises an unquestioned mandate for Peace. The masses hail every move for international sanity with loud acclaim. They are easily lifted into heights of vision and hope. The difficulty is not primarily one of rousing desire among the people but rather that of finding leaders who will not betray the desire and be blind to the hope. We need statesmen with a technique of peace who dare to do things greatly. If we cannot find them, then the time has come for the people who dare great things to acquire the technique.

Allahabad may become a name as familiar in the history of Indian independence as Lexington or Concord in the history of American independence—and a name even more impressive and glorious! Like the shot fired at Concord Bridge, what happened at Allahabad the other day has gone "round the world," marking as it does the climax of Mahatma Gandhi's non-co-operation movement, and the beginning of a final struggle between British military power and the free spirit of the Indian people. The event to which we refer was the successful boycott of the Prince of Wales by the native population of Allahabad. The occasion of the Prince's visit to this city called, of course, for a great outpouring of the people in welcome to royalty. Instead of vast and joyous crowds of men and women, however, the Prince of Wales on his passage through the town looked on empty streets; and instead of enthusiastic shouts of welcome, he heard only the silence of closed houses and deserted highways. So thorough was the organization of the non-co-operationists under the leadership of Gandhi, and so definite the understanding of the method of the boycott as a weapon of hostility to the government, that the Indians with one accord refused to participate in the great spectacle of pageantry which had been prepared, or even to look upon it. That such form of protest against tryanny is more impressive and effective than any outbreak of violence, is obvious enough. Governmental authorities, from Assyrian days down to our own, know just how, and have full means, to deal with open rioting and rebellion; but these authorities find themselves helpless when confronted by passive resistance. Meager reports coming from India show that in other cities the Prince of Wales has encountered the same kind of boycott, but in no other place was it carried through so effectively as in Allahabad. Here is perfect demonstration of the power of Gandhi when given time and opportunity. His influence over his people is probably greater and more far-flung than any influence exercised by any nationalistic leader in the whole range of human history. The world has never seen in character and effectiveness such a movement as this transcendant Indian has set on foot.

If further evidence is wanted of the effectiveness of non-resistance as a social policy, we are getting it in abundance these days in despatches from India. For example, on December 5th, came the news that Lajpat Rai, leader of Gandhi's movement in the Punjab, had been arrested. On December 6th, we were informed that the lieutenant-governor at Rangoon had decided to intern the leaders of the nationalist government during

the visit of the Prince of Wales to Bombay. On December 8th arrived the word that Pundit Motilal Nehru, who is Gandhi's representative in the United Provinces, has been imprisoned at Allahabad. Lastly, on December 10th, a despatch is received from Calcutta to the effect that there have been wholesale arrests of non-co-operationists, and that among those seized were the wife, son and sister of C. R. Das, Gandhi's leader in Bengal. A despatch on the following day told of the arrest of Das himself. All this means, of course, that the English government has been driven to desperation, and has therefore resolved to use violent coercion against those who have adopted as the first plank of their platform the policy of non-violence. And this is being done, be it noted, by the same government which is now being lauded to the skies for granting dominion freedom to Ireland! Could there be more disgusting hypocrisy than this, a more open and shameless exhibition of the essential dishonesty of Lloyd-George and his associates! But friends of India need not worry. Gandhi has found the true method of successful revolt, is training the people to its use, and is making progress which is miraculous. Britain faces in this mystic Indian an enemy more terrible than Napoleon or Kaiser Wilhelm.

Last week there came to our desk a copy of the address delivered in September by Francis P. Garvan, President of the Chemical Foundation, before the Joint Session of the Society of Chemical Industry and the American Chemical Society, at Columbia University. This address is one long tirade against Germany, ending with the presentation of the old "chestnut" that war can only be stopped by making it so horrible that men will not dare to participate in it. Mr. Garvan urges chemists to make "peace (seem) more and more desirable" by teaching "war-science how to destroy thousands at a stroke, to ruin whole cities in the space of a breath drawn in the middle of the night." On the same day that we read this address, there came to us a copy of resolutions adopted at Baltimore by the annual convention of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, demanding that the use of chemicals in warfare be continued and such preparation for war be authorized as will enable the United States to manufacture poison gases in large quantities in time of war. A newspaper despatch covering this convention quotes Dr. Raymond F. Bacon, director of the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, University of Pittsburgh, as saying that "the possibility of ideal war was offered in the further development of gas warfare." All of this shows that, in all probability, we have got to begin our campaign for disarmament all over again. We are getting rid of dreadnaughts only to make room for gas-machinery, escaping from gun-makers and powder manufacturers only to fall into the more monstrous hands of chemists! It also brings pertinently to mind a passage in George Bernard Shaw's "Back to Methuselah," in which is forecasted "a general massacre of men of science"! This took place, says Shaw, "in the twenty-first century of the pseudo-Christian era, when all their laboratories were demolished, and all their apparatus destroyed."

If the recent municipal elections in New York and Boston mean any one thing, it is that an infallible rule has been discovered for political victory. If a party or group wants to win the mayoralty of a city, all it has to do is to secure *the opposition of the newspapers!* Mayor Hylan of New York was re-elected in November by the largest majority ever recorded in the history of the city, and he was opposed by every newspaper, both morning and evening, except the Hearst journals. Mr. Curley in Boston, a man as disreputable as his New York compeer is ridiculous, was elected by a small majority in a four-cornered contest, and he also was opposed by every Boston newspaper with the exception of the *American.* We believe that Mayor Thompson's experience in Chicago is similar. It is quite inconceivable that anything can disturb the complacency of the American newspaper press, and yet it would seem as though such happenings as these would set at least a few of the more intelligent newspaper men thinking pretty hard. For do they not mean that the majority of our electors, in our great cities at least, act upon the supposition that there must be something bad about a man who has the support of the newspapers, as there must also be something good about a man who is opposed by the newspapers? In other words, our daily press has not only lost the confidence of the public, but, what is more serious, has won its absolute contempt and distrust! In the larger field of social life, it may be laid down as a safe rule that it is today a help and not a hindrance for a minister, a social worker, a political leader, or a reformer, to have the enmity of the newspapers of his community.

One of the arguments which is constantly made against the possibility of a Community Church, is the supposed fact that theological differences are too strongly intrenched in individuals. The sceptic honestly doubts whether Jew and Gentile, Trinitarian and Unitarian, Damnationist and Universalist can ever associate peacefully together in religious work and worship. The argument has a certain *a priori* validity. The only difficulty with it is that the facts disprove it! The Boston Community Church is perhaps as good an illustration as can be found. Among the preachers have been Unitarians, Episcopalians, Jews, Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers, Chinese, Russians, Universalists, Methodists, Eclectics and Theological Peripatetics. And not once in the history of the church has there been the slightest disposition on

the part of anybody to raise troublesome or divisive issues relating to theological creeds. The mingling of various religious views in one community expression is no longer a mere hypothesis. It is a proved fact.

The death of Saint-Saens in his winter refuge in Algiers marks the passing of the supreme representative of the classical tradition in music in our time. For more than two generations Saint-Saens has been numbered among the half-dozen greatest musical geniuses of his day. With his contemporary, Brahms, of Germany, he maintained in its full glory what may be called the old or classic school of music as contrasted with those newer schools which gave their peculiar character to the later productions of our time. German music after Wagner, and in spite of Brahms, developed almost exclusively under the Wagnerian inspiration, and reached its perfect splendor in the more inspired symphonic poems and operas of Richard Strauss. French music, under the influence of Caesar Franck, developed its own particular type of inspiration, a type of the rarest and highest order but of an essentially exotic character which gave it a peculiarly limited appeal. Saint-Saens more than Brahms entered into full appreciation of Wagner and his successors, and even of the later French composers of the extreme Debussey school. But in his own work he remained steadfast to the great tradition of the past, and wrote in classic form and under the influence of the classic tradition. His passing perhaps marks the end of this great chapter of music in our time. His own compositions in oratorio, opera and symphonic form were numerous; some of them are immortal. His last visit to this country leaves a memorable picture of a simple, kindly old man, a great pianist and organist, an unspoiled genius, a broad and understanding heart. The great performances of "Samson and Delilah" at the Metropolitan Opera House may be taken this season as his fitting requiem.

A Matter of Importance

Since I finished the series of articles, "Duty to Civilization," I have spent six months in Europe studying the conditions arising out of the war and its aftermath. It has been a very interesting experience; depressing, still an experience of great significance. The Europe I knew so well is gone. The essential things of existence, those of the spirit have been destroyed. The international harmony is no more. When the things of the spirit, the precious verities which did prevail in spite of the work of the chauvinists and imperialists, are scorned and derided by those who sit in high places, there seems little hope for Europe as a whole. The attitude of mind of those in authority in Great Britain and France seemed to me so callous, as to what destiny had in store for Europe, that it was difficult for an old European to imagine the London and Paris of today existed before August, 1914. What other result but ruin could be expected from the men who destroyed Europe in seeking a get-rich-quick method of dividing the treasure areas of Africa and Asia? It does seem absurd to catch one's self cogitating such questions as: "Why is Europe so changed?" "Why do people seem ignorant of what Europe means to the world?" In the large capitals one is frequently struck with an obstinancy in official circles which will admit of no discussion of Europe's problems as a whole. To mention Russia or Germany, in many houses in London or Paris, where the host is connected with leading officials, is to incur often enough not only rudeness from one's fellow guests, but the displeasure of one's host. It is almost unbelievable that a war, even of this one's magnitude, could make educated people so ridiculously silly. If any one had predicted ten years ago that, because of the European war, such prejudices would exist in English society affected by officials, such a one would have been considered a madman. Yet, there it is.

As for Paris, the situation there is too utterly preposterous for words: to make matters infinitely worse than they were in political circles before the war began, the wretched Parisian is cursed with a troop of sycophantic American ribbon-hunters who are a positive danger to the common people of France. Surely it is quite bad enough to suffer the Paris editions of two American newspapers; these exhibitions of our journalistic ideals are inflicted upon the Parisians seven days a week; add to this the particularly aggravating spectacle of the visitors who "do" the devastated area, who capture the most expensive hotels, dress and millinery establishments, and give gratuitously vulgar displays of wealth at a time when people in Paris and London, as well as in Berlin and Vienna, are suffering, not only a great reduction in fortune, but, in many cases, penury itself. A brilliant young Frenchman, referring to this state of affairs, said, that he "for one would never ask America for financial aid. All he wished America to do was to send a deputation of its intelligent section of the community to visit Paris next holiday season." The rebuke was well merited.

Paris of the pleasure-seeking American, is, however, not Paris at all. Indeed it never was Paris. All that area, to use the language of the estate agent, bounded by Rue de Rivoli, Rue Royale, the Boulevards to the Porte St. Martin, may be the heaven of our sight-seers, but Paris is not there. For myself, I find Paris on the other side of the river. There is more of Paris to be found from the Beaux Arts to the Luxembourg and

the Odeon, than is to be found in any of the hotels or salons where official society gathers.

In other channels of life there are to be found in Europe, movements promulgated by bright young people which give one a thrill of encouragement. In France there are four or five young societies that have drawn together numbers of brilliant young men and women of a highly cultivated outlook on life. (I do not refer to the Clarté group or any of its affiliations.) These groups are engaged upon the exceedingly practical work of collecting the documents relating to the origin of the European debacle, and seeking from the study of the documents how Europe can be reconciled and restored on the basis of reason and justice. Unfortunately these movements are conducted by exceedingly poor men and women; and that means they are of no interest to the daily press. There was a time when it was not difficult to get some mention in a Parisian daily of wide circulation of a worthy object, the purpose of some movement directed by poor people. In London it was quite a simple thing to engage the attention of an editor, and indeed I have known the time in England when editors of opposition papers readily gave some space to projects promulgated by the other side. Alas, that is all gone, and England today suffers mightily for this loss. Only poor men are left in England to carry on the work of the radical.

Why is it that the Europe known to the cultivated mind has been left in a state of suspension ever since the Armistice, a period of over three years? That is the question that pops up every now and then, and utterly confounds the imagination. Can it be that no one in authority has been interested in Europe? That all the resounding periods of the voluble statesmen have been just so much rhetoric? Their actions prove how much their words are worth. They talk but do not think, they act but do not deliberate. A psychologist said, "The statemen of the world today must have supplied Professor John B. Watson of the Johns Hopkins University with the material that was necessary for his work, 'Behavior,' which tells us that it cannot be ascertained that we think when we act, and that in observing the behavior of human beings, no evidence of thought has so far been found."

It is want of thought that retards the work of restoration in Europe. Strangely enough though, the common people cannot be held guilty of this omission. This is not at all obvious when one moves about the well to do quarters of European capitals. One must go far afield to find evidence of this brooding of the common folk. How exceedingly difficult it is for them to make any great progress towards elucidation of the doubts and anxieties with which their minds have been filled during this generation, can be estimated when one scans the newspapers and other periodicals they read constantly. Consider for a moment what the French artisan, who has been trying to get his mind into working order, must have suffered every day during the month of November when the French journals without exception, poured out a stream of vindictive, scurrilous abuse on Great Britain, while the question of the Angora secret treaty was discussed. The wretched artisan could scarcely withstand the current of passion that was injected into him every day by the editors of his country's papers. The only thing left for him to do, if he desired to keep his reason, was to abstain rigorously from reading any French journal. On the other hand, consider the plight of the English workingman who had arrived at the stage when he decided to think things out for himself, reading every day during October and the first half of November, the unmitigated drivel of Sir Basil Thompson, the spy-chaser, and all the blood and thunder stories about German secret arms factories, the secret German army of six million men, etc., published by the Northcliffe press. How can any clear thinking be done by newspaper readers? The whole process of the news service is infected by a poison more devastating in its consequences than all the gasses invented by the chemists of the belligerents during the war. The war-press of the world has succeeded in producing the dead mind. Now, one of the things that most surely retards reconciliation and restoration in Europe, and delays the work of reconstruction in the world at large, is the extremely effective work done by the war-propagandists in injecting the poison of hate into the souls of hundreds of thousands of men and women of the upper classes. It is among the people who have time to read and think, who have the advantages of much wealth, and a little culture, that one observes the effect of the poison most clearly. An ex-service soldier in London told me that "the poor hate no more, but the rich keep it up." There is much truth in this. As an example of what has been done to fan the fires of hate, let us take the most potent of all the war-propagandists' material, that which made the fighting spirit possible among the Allies—the question of the alleged atrocities of the German army in Belgium. It cannot be gainsaid that anything was more effective than the stories of "the ruthless barbarities of the German army," as the war-propagandists circulated them in their reports, their commissions, and their speeches, all with the connivance and sanction of their governments. The stories of German atrocities that were invented have, as I was told by a member of the British Censors' Department, "done their work too well." Certainly anybody with a grain of common sense should have known before the war was a year old, that the statesmen who would have to make a peace, would rue the day they permitted the stories to be told. Now these statesmen find it exceedingly difficult to propose anything which savors of reconciliation, because the public mind is still freighted with the lies of horror and hatred

spread by the war-propagandists. In this respect, consider Captain E. N. Bennett's publication, "The German Army in Belgium," a translation of the official German reply to the Bryce Report, and the several Belgian commissions of inquiry as to the conduct of the Kaiser's troops in Belgium. Surely one can rely upon the impartial judgment of Captain Bennett, a great scholar of Oxford, an ex-member of Parliament, a soldier of distinction, who served in Belgium, France and Servia, and was attached to headquarters IX Army Corps, British Expeditionary Force. In his foreword, Captain Bennett says the following about the Bryce Report:

> "It is obvious that some of these refugees were not eye-witnesses of the outrages they describe, for they had fled from their homes and merely record their own inferences as to events which had occurred during their absence. Another serious weakness in the Report arises from the fact that the various barristers and others who were sent round to interview these refugees were with very few exceptions quite unable to converse fluently in French and wholly ignorant of Flemish. Finally, none of the evidence was taken on oath. Here then we have an ill-digested mass of unsworn statements—some merely at second hand—made by excited and angry Belgians, and transmitted by interpreters, themselves unsworn, which is presented to the world as final and conclusive proof of Germany's guilt, while at the same time the publication in this country of a plain translation of Germany's official defence against these charges was forbidden by the censor. The testimony of the Bryce Report served its purpose and aroused a volume of indignant and scandalized opinion which provided one of the sharpest weapons employed against our chief enemy; but it must be admitted that the methods by which it was compiled were so lax and uncritical that the results sink far below the level ordinarily demanded by the serious historian."

Quite so, but the Bryce Report was swallowed whole, and it is extremely difficult to make people disgorge that meal of horror. The result is that Captain Bennett's book published last April, has scarcely been noticed by the press that made so much capital out of the Bryce Report. We have reached the day, when, so far as the press is concerned, there is no other side to the case. Captain Bennett's pages of quotations from the Belgian papers published in the early days of the war, are quite sufficient to make any decent-minded person wish to reconsider the whole question of atrocities in Belgium, but I doubt very much whether any of the excited war-historians of Allied countries will care to see this work. They have shown no desire to ascertain the truth about these things, and yet this is a matter which gravely affects the whole future of Europe, affects indeed the progress of mankind. For my part, I do not think it is possible for us to do what is right and necessary in Europe, so long as the poison of the war-propagandists deadens the mind. The work is so enormous, the area to be covered is so vast, and the interests so complex, that it is not to be imagined anything but a resolute, fearless, truth-seeking mind can avail. The soldier that was gassed is a pitiable object, and I have seen and dealt with many, but the civilian who saw no war, who remained at home to be gassed by war-propagandists, is the most pitiable object on the face of the earth.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

A New Way to Abolish War

UNITY publishes this week one of the most important articles which has ever appeared in its columns. We refer to the "Outlawry of War," by Mr. S. O. Levinson, to which we invite the most earnest attention of our readers.

The new and creative idea in Mr. Levinson's argument is to be found in his suggestion that war cannot be abolished by the method of seeking to abolish its causes. These causes, of course, must ultimately be removed before the problem of war can finally and forever be settled. But this is a thing which cannot be done all at once, nor even perhaps through centuries. The causes of war are deep-rooted not only in our political arrangements and economic systems, but in those very elements of human nature which are so fundamental as to seem, from any particular moment of time, to be ineradicable. If we cannot get rid of war, or at least of the practical evils of war, until these causes have finally been removed, we must live with this abomination for an indefinite period. But this is just the thing which, in this period of history at least, is no longer possible! War has suddenly become so destructive that civilization can no longer keep house with it in the same world. A crisis is at hand which demands that either war or civilization shall go.

It is in the meeting of this terrible dilemma that Mr. Levinson offers so impressive and fruitful a suggestion. He points out that war exists pragmatically as a means of settling disputes between nations, and persists in spite of all its destructive horrors, because it is the only existing means of settling such disputes. As such it is formally recognized by international law, and thus established as a perfectly proper and legal institution for the serving of this end. Nations now have a right to go to war, just as litigants in the United States have a right to go to the Supreme Court, as the last appeal for the determination of a disputed issue. What we have got to do, says Mr. Levinson, if we would abolish war at once, is to provide a substitute

which will enable us to handle this phenomenon of antagonism and conflict which must persist so long at least as what we now call the causes of war persist. In other words, he urges that we abolish war by formal enactment, and substitute therefor a legal process by the consent and agreement of nations.

The perfect analogy of his proposal is to be found in the history of the abolition of the institution of duelling. Mr. Levinson points out with great cogency that when duelling came to be recognized as a nuisance which must be done away with for the sake of peace and order in the community, nobody took up the problem from the standpoint of the causes of duelling! These causes, like the causes of war, were deep-rooted in the weaknesses and follies of human nature, and if we had waited to abolish these causes before doing anything about duelling, this insane and destructive practice of "fighting it out" between individuals would be with us still. As it was, men ignored the causes for the time being, and made up their minds that, even while these causes were still operating, they would do away with duelling by digging a new channel, so to speak, into which the combative instincts of man could flow and thus escape. Duelling, as we now know, was practically done away with in a night—first, by writing it into the law as a crime; and, secondly, by providing a new, more sensible, less wasteful, and most just method of settling those disputes of fact and honor which took men to the duelling grounds. We still have fights today, but duelling as an institution has disappeared in favor of the institution of law and court procedure.

It is this method which Mr. Levinson would now follow in handling the problem of war. He would have the nations unite in the simple business (1) of writing and adopting an international code of law; (2) of writing into this code the declaration that war is a crime to be punished by the law of nations; (3) of establishing a court for the interpretation and enforcement of international law; (4) of sustaining this court as the United States Supreme Court is sustained, not by the force of arms but by the normal sanction of public opinion. It should be carefully noted that this program bears no comparison of any kind with the program of The Hague Conferences of Peace, with which it is so easy to compare it superficially. The Hague Conferences never provided for any codification of international law, and thus left the world where it is today—in a state of chaos. The Hague Conferences never outlawed war, but on the contrary, strengthened and sanctified its legality by providing for specified conditions under which it should be waged. The Hague Conferences never established any international court, but only a board of arbitration which is a very different and in itself infinitely ridiculous thing. Lastly, The Hague Conferences never at any time placed any reliance on moral sanctions, but always accepted force as the final resort of international relationships. Mr. Levinson has worked out a new course of action, as different from The Hague Conferences on the one hand, as from Leagues of Nations, Disarmament Conferences and treaties of alliances on the other. His proposal is strong in the sense that it begins at just the point where the nations in their own domestic experience have solved their internal difficulties, and asks that international problems be handled by a simple extension into the general field of what already has been triumphantly established in the local field.

Two things commend this program to our acceptance. The first is this—that, without abandoning what must be the fundamental fight for the removal of the political, economic and psychological causes of war, Mr. Levinson provides a program calculated to remove at once the immediate and repeated incidence of war and thus to enable the world to survive the practical crisis which now confronts it. The second is this—that Mr. Levinson bases his program upon a moral interpretation of the universe. His ultimate confidence is not in arms but in the spirit. As an attempt to work out the non-resistant idea in the field of law, this argument appeals at once to our reason and imagination. We rejoice to announce that an organization has been formed for the presentation of this program to the citizenship of America. UNITY is happy to have this share in helping on its work.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

SECOND SIGHT.

Can the world have been created for you and me to do all that fills our days:
Care of a house, lawn, shop, billion dollar business?
These are not enough for us.
Can the world have been created for the nations to do all that fills their days:
Trading, peacefully penetrating, warring,
Or when the mood changes, motoring down one another's roads, decorating one another, bowing at one another's courts?
These are not enough for the nations.
What is the world for?

Once in an apple orchard at mid-day
I had a moment of second sight as I watched a child at play.
She shone with light like a holy child. She was pure.
She was growing. She was nothing, nothing but love.
She was all that we might be, we and the nations.
She was all that we shall be.
Come, let us face it!

"The Secret Way" (Macmillan). —*Zona Gale.*

Outlawry of War

INTRODUCTION

War between nations with all its attendant horrors has always been, and is now, perfectly legal. A direct attack by one nation on another, no matter how unjustified, is a legal procedure. Even the Kaiser was violating no known law by declaring war in 1914. Whatever value wars may have had in the past, these last years have shown modern war to be so terrible an instrument, so far reaching in its destruction and the results of that destruction, that its use in our closely interdependent present-day civilization jeopardizes the very life of that civilization.

The appeal to force, therefore, between nations as between individuals, is, under existing conditions, intolerable and should be forever outlawed. This was the method by which the legal war between individuals, called duelling, was abolished—the institution was made a crime and punished as such. The nations can do the same for war, and establish orderly legal procedure to settle their disputes, and make war between nations a public crime under an international code of law.

In any reform there are two elements—the principle and the methods by which the principle is made effective. The following pages contain a statement of the principle and certain suggestions as to how it can be carried out. They have been carefully prepared, and no less an authority than the late Senator Knox (Secretary of State under President Taft) believed them to be practicable. But like all questions of method they are subject to suggestion and modification. Whether they shall be enforced by President Harding's Association of Nations, by some modified form of the present League, by a future Hague Conference, or by some machinery yet to be created—does not impair the validity of the principle of the outlawry of war.

Salmon O. Levinson, Chairman
Mrs. B. F. Langworthy, Secretary
Margaret Drier Robins
F. R. Moulton
Raymond Robins
Edward Osgood Brown
Albert H. Loeb
Mrs. William S. Hefferan
Mrs. A. G. Becker
Joseph M. Artman
Milton F. Goodman
Mrs. Russell Tyson

Committee.

"If I catch the conscience of America we'll lead the world to outlaw war."

Senator Harding, September 4, 1920.

"Let us give of our influence and strength, yea, of our aspirations and convictions, to put mankind on a higher plane, with war's distressing and depressing tragedies barred from the stage of righteous civilization."

"There must be, there shall be, the commanding voice of a conscious civilization against armed warfare."

President Harding at Arlington, November 11, 1921.

"The call is not of the United States of America alone, it is rather the spoken word of a war-weary world, struggling for restoration, hungering and thirsting for better relationship; of humanity crying for relief and craving assurances of lasting peace."

"Contemplating the measureless cost of war and the continuing burden of armament, all thoughtful peoples wish for real limitations of armament and would like war outlawed."

President Harding Keynote Conference. Address, November, 12, 1921.

"As soon as world conditions permit participation therein by all peoples, initiate an international conference to formulate for submission to the nations of the world with a view to adoption by them, an arrangement providing for the codification of international law, the establishment of a court of international justice and the outlawry of war. This arrangement to be as complete, comprehensive and compelling as shall be consistent with human rights and human liberty and with the progress of civilization."

P. C. Knox Speech in U. S. Senate, May 5, 1920.

"Above all, making sure that war shall henceforth be declared to be a crime punishable by the law of nations."

Lloyd George, Great Britain's Peace Aims, June, 1918.

"War in itself and for itself is the greatest crime in the world and the glory of victory pursued for itself is a crime. This world is made for peace and for work in peace time. The first duty is to work for our people, not to fight."

Marshal Foch, Detroit, November 7, 1921.

FOREWORD

By Dr. John Dewey, Columbia University.

There are at least some persons who in the days just before and after the Armistice favored a League of Nations who afterwards changed their mind. As one such person I should like to mention two reasons for the change, not for controversial purposes or to make a contrast which Mr. Levinson has himself wisely refrained from making, but for the sake of indicating why those who favored the League and those who now oppose it should unite in favoring the plan for a world court based upon world codification of international law having for its major premise the outlawry of war. The peoples of the world are not yet educated enough in international affairs to guarantee the successful workings of a political League, even supposing the idea is inherently desirable. And any present scheme is bound to make much of the sanction of physical force against recalcitrant nations. In that way, it continues the old tradition of the lawfulness of war. What the world now needs is enlightenment and a concentration of moral forces. The plan suggested by Levinson is simple and understandable. Like all really simple and intelligible propositions, it goes to the root of the situation. Above all it does more than any other plan yet proposed to provide natural and orderly agencies for enlightening the peoples regarding disputes among nations, and for concentrating all the moral forces of

the world against modern war, that abomination of abominations. If we cannot trust to the good-will and good faith of the peoples of the world expressing the common purpose and judgment through law, the only means of expression the world has discovered for all other disputes, no political machinery will work and the world is doomed to war and doomed by war.

FOREWORD

By Judge Edward O. Brown, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Dewey's foreword to Mr. Levinson's interesting and significant brochure speaks for those who just before and after the Armistice favored a League of Nations, and subsequently changed their minds. I have been in favor of the League of Nations from the day that the plan for it took form in 1915,—and have *not* changed my mind. It is not my purpose to be controversial any more than it was Dr. Dewey's. I will not therefore undertake to give reasons for my belief that the solidarity of civilization has been advanced by the actual definite existence of the League of Nations, even in its present defective and inefficient form—a form which must continue to be defective and inefficient until the United States and Germany are both members of it. I am merely stating my belief and position to emphasize *my* opinion, as it is Dr. Dewey's, that there is no reason why friends and foes of the League as it exists or as it may be amended should not unite in favoring the plan which Mr. Levinson has so forcefully outlined.

It seems to me incredible that any man can approve or defend war as a method of settling disputes between races, peoples or nations. If he does so, he is preaching the devil's doctrine. Defense of ourselves and of others attacked aggressively and wantonly may compel resort to any arms that may be available, and even the virtues which way show themselves in such a defensive war are the product of prior peaceful times, while the vices which become rampant and widespread during and after it are developed and aggravated by the war itself.

Attempts to render war less cruel or savage by formulating so-called "laws of war" and to provide for its conduct humanely are food to the gods for laughter! You cannot feed tigers on oranges.

But to formulate and codify laws, rules and decisions which shall "outlaw" aggressive war and declare it to be the chief of crimes and thereby prevent it, ought not to be a hopeless endeavor.

Such a noble effort Mr. Levinson is trying to foster. The heart of his plan, as I view it, is the codification of International Law, by leading jurists of the world, with all civilized nations participating, and the establishment of a permanent International Court with real jurisdiction to take cognizance of offenses against such a Code, and to hear and determine purely international disputes.

Whatever may be the merits or defects of the Present League of Nations neither that nor any other association of nations that takes its place can be of its proper benefit to the world without such a codification and such a Court.

FOREWORD

By Raymond Robins, Chicago, Ill.

The people of the world are ready and eager for the next step in the slow advance from savagery toward international civilization. They believe that the boundless sacrifices and sufferings of the Great War should have some milestone of progress in the moral code of mankind.

They want war unmasked and declared in international law to be what it is in fact, the supreme enemy of the human race.

They want the conscience of men everywhere to think of war, not as an honorable profession, not as the path to glory and power, but as the arch murderer of the youth of the race—the master assassin of motherhood and the home.

They want war revealed as the paralysis of production and the suicide of commerce, the betrayal of brotherhood, the poison in the cup of good-will between the nations of the earth, the forerunner of pestilence and famine, spreading ruin and desolation alike upon the victors and the vanquished and crucifying Christ afresh on every battlefield.

They want war outlawed as a crime against the law of nations and the life of humanity.

They want militarists branded as super felons among the criminals of the earth.

Let the first step toward the outlawry of war be taken by the conference now at Washington, and it will in this act alone, mark an epoch in the life of the race and lift mankind to new levels of moral understanding and power. This step would begin the liberation of the people from the age long thraldom of the sword and prove that the countless dead on all the battlefields of the Great War have not died in vain.

PLAN TO OUTLAW WAR*

A Conference of all Civilized Nations to be called for the creation and codification of international law; the code to contain, among other things, the following provisions, with which all the other provisions of the code must not be in conflict:

1. The further use of war as an institution for the settlement of international disputes shall be abolished.
2. War between nations shall be declared to be a public crime, punishable by the law of nations.
3. War shall be defined in the code and the right of defense against actual or imminent attack shall be preserved.
4. All annexations, exactions or seizures, by force, duress or fraud, shall be null and void.
5. An international court with affirmative jurisdiction over purely international disputes shall be created modelled as nearly as may be on the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court over controversies between states. All purely international disputes as defined by the code shall be decided and settled by the international court sitting as a judicial body, which shall be given jurisdiction over all parties to a dispute upon the petition of any party to the dispute or of any signatory nation.
6. All nations shall agree to abide and be bound by and in good faith to carry out the orders, decrees and decisions of such Court.
7. One nation cannot summon another before the International Court except in respect to a matter of international and common concern to the contending nations, and the jurisdiction of the court shall not extend to matters of governmental, domestic or protective policy unless one of the disputing parties has by treaty

*Formulated in 1919 by the late Senator Knox and the author.

or otherwise given another country a claim that involves these subjects. The classes of disputes excluded from the jurisdiction of the international court should be specifically enumerated in the code and not be left open to the flexible and dangerous distinction between justiciable and non-justiciable controversies.

8. The court should sit in the hemisphere of the contending nations; and if the disputants live in opposite hemispheres, then in the hemisphere of the defendant nation.

9. National armaments to be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety and with the necessities of international requirements.

10. Abolition of professional soldiery and the substitution of a potential army through citizen soldiery on the Swiss model.

11. All nations shall make public report once each year setting forth fully their military and naval armaments, structural and chemical. These reports to be verified by authorized committees.

12. The doctrines of military necessity, retaliation and reprisal which are open to such flagrant and abhorrent abuse, shall be eliminated.

An international arrangement based on the foregoing would not impair our independence or our sovereignty; it would relieve the world of the destructive incubus of war; it would civilize international relations by the substitution of real law and a real court for the bloody decisions of war; it would preserve the Monroe Doctrine, our tariff and revenue policies, our right to repel invasion, our right to expel aliens and all other domestic and protective policies (the other nations to enjoy corresponding rights and policies); it would eliminate aggression, duress, fraud and secret diplomacy in international dealings; it would rob the profession of killing of its glory and prestige, and it would outlaw war by making it a public crime punishable by the law of nations.

Analysis of Plan

1. Civilization has been marked in its upward trend out of savagery into its present condition by the evolution of law and courts to supplant methods of violence and force.

2. Processes of courts and law have been adopted in all human relations, from individuals and corporations to states within a nation, except in the international field. Here disputes between nations can be compulsorily settled only by force of arms. There is no authoritative law or court. Nations remain in this regard in a state of nature.

3. Disputes are human and inevitable whether between individuals or between nations. War is inhuman and is inevitable only by tradition.

4. There are but two ways of compelling settlement of disputes whether intranational or international in character; one is by force and the other is by law. In international controversies the resort to force has always been open.

5. War is an institution. An institution is a custom not contrary to law established over long periods among peoples and races. The church is an institution; marriage is an institution; slavery *was* an institution.

6. All wars between nations are legal. War has never been made unlawful by any convention or treaty or so-called international law since the time of Adam. It is at once the greatest and most lawful "crime" in the world.

7. For example, suppose the Kaiser had simply declared in 1914 that Germany's desire for a place in the sun meant he would take the whole of France and Belgium, and thereupon declared war on both those countries:—there is nothing in any work on international law or in any treaty or convention that would have made that pronouncement of war illegal. Wars may be wicked and cruel but not unlawful. "The King can do no wrong."

8. In dealing with any other form of evil our first impulse is to have the legislature or congress pass a law making the practice illegal and criminal. If that is the way to deal with ordinary grievances, why not try the beaten path with the greatest of all wrongs? We want not "laws of war" but "laws against war" as we have laws against murder and burglary. The recent revival at Washington of proposals for "rules" regulating or prohibiting the use of poison gases and submarines seems like sheer mockery so long as war itself remains legal. Besides, the last war certainly demonstrated the futility of relying on "rules of humanized warfare."

9. The farcical exhibition at Versailles of the attempt to indict the Kaiser for the "crime" of starting the war emphasizes this point. There never was a law against war upon which to base such an indictment. And strange to say, the nations, thwarted by this terrible defect in international law, did not adopt a convention, enact a law or take any steps at Versailles to make war a crime and thus lay the foundation for the indictment of the "next Kaiser."

10. The reduction of armaments is most valuable as an economic remedy and a splendid step in the right direction. The people rightly demand and will have it. But that does not lay the axe to the root. Suppose all countries should reduce their armaments to what they were say in 1870 or in 1850 or in 1800—was the world not cursed with war then? Indeed, the United States had very small armaments in 1917 but had the intrinsic power to create large ones by 1918. The logic of disarmament, according to General Hugh S. Johnson, in a series of brilliant articles in the New York *World,* is as follows: "Finally it must be recognized that no possible project of disarmament can create a condition of equilibrium as between weak and powerful nations. . . . A disproportionate condition would remain if all nations would completely disarm just as it would remain if all would arm to the limit of their resource. . . . The justification of this is in part the principle that a giant with a sword is little, if any, more dangerous to a Lilliputian than a giant with a club."

We want not fewer wars but no wars; not less destructive wars but no wars at all. Limitation of armament is not enough. In the crisp words of President Harding, the crying need is: "Less of armament and none of war."

11. The closest historical analogy to war is the duel, "duellum" and "bellum" both originally meaning war. The duel had its origin in Germany and now survives to some extent there and in France and Italy. In England and in this country it passed muster for centuries, remaining lawful because of the "honor" element which it was supposed to uphold. It was as late as 1850 before the duel was pronounced murder in the last of our states and thus outlawed. The practice of duelling is now extinct because it is plain

murder under our laws. Questions of "honor" were as fallacious as they were bountiful in the institution of duelling and as they are still in the institution of war. Man has not become a mollycoddle because he cannot resent every supposed affront to his "honor" by a sword-thrust or a bullet. We have nobly abolished the institutions of duelling and slavery; why not abolish the institution of war?

12. In creating a real international court, the subtle and mischievous distinction between justiciable (triable) and non-justiciable (not triable) controversies must not be permitted to defeat its jurisdiction. If it lies in the power of a nation itself to say that a cause is non-justiciable and that therefore the court cannot take jurisdiction over it, all judicial power crumbles. It is not only easy for chancellors or premiers to give a dispute a non-justiciable turn but, as a matter of fact, practically all the wars in the past hundred and fifty years have started from non-justiciable causes. That was the case in the late war. The word "non-justiciable" is but a new edition of the old phrase "national honor and vital interests." While it is true that a nation's honor and its vital interests should be safeguarded, this exception is used not to safeguard these things but to justify and fortify war. The new code must itself state what causes are within the jurisdiction of the court and what are not, and must now allow an individual country to decide the matter for the court. The proposed plan covers this by excluding from the jurisdiction of the court all domestic and protective questions (like revenues, immigration, Monroe Doctrine, etc.) which shall be agreed upon for all countries and enumerated in the code. In this way the jurisdiction of the court over all purely international disputes can be protected and maintained.

13. The proposition that the causes of things must be first removed, e. g., the causes of war, the causes of armament, etc., is fallacious and plays into the hands of militarists. However commendable it is to solve the problems of evil and injustice in the world great reforms cannot await such slow and indefinite processes. Thus: Suppose an attempt had been made to remove the causes of duelling before outlawing it; would the day before judgment day have seen it abolished? No. The causes of duelling were as various as human motives. The causes of war or of armament or of duelling (or of disputes, which are basic to the foregoing) will be removed when the era of the brotherhood of man is ushered in and not before.

It is claimed by some that the underlying causes of war are existing trade barriers and that if we remove these we will eliminate war. Others insist that religious and race hatreds and prejudices cause war. But these trade barriers and hatreds merely beget disputes which the bloody "court" of war settles. *It is this legal device of violence that must be removed. For the remedy of war has now become always worse than the disease.* We must continue more and more to put civilization under the control of law and courts and not wait until we have removed causes that are buried perhaps irrevocably in the breast of human nature.

14. From the foregoing it follows that in order to outlaw war, it is necessary to codify international law, and one of the first articles of the code should abolish the institution of war for the settlement of disputes between nations, by making it illegal and criminal. A real court should be created with power judicially to hear and determine all international controversies as enumerated in the code.

15. The code should be prepared by the leading statesmen and jurists of the world with all civilized nations represented in an International Conference called for that purpose. It may take two years to prepare such a code. Senator Knox thought it would take five years. Therefore, a commitment in principle to a plan for the codification of international law, the creation of a court with affirmative specified jurisdiction and the criminal outlawry of war is all that is necessary at this time. The Code Conference will do the rest.

16. The expense of securing and liberally paying for the services of the best brains of the world for the work of codification, and also giving each member of the Conference a life pension, will not exceed one one-hundredth of one per cent of the cost of the last war, or thirty million dollars.

17. It remains to consider the obstacles and objections to such a program. They seem to be as follows:

(a) The love of power that resides in rulers and their ministers which disincline them to lose their greatest weapon. This, of course, applies mainly to the large nations, as most of the small nations have been willing to do away with war for many years. At both Hague Conferences the small nations tried to have universal obligatory arbitration adopted, but the big nations always defeated it. The first obstacle thus applies to the large nations and usually takes on this word-formula: "The world is not yet ready for so great a step." The United States, however, through Mr. Choate, at the second Hague Conference, took a leading stand in favor of universal arbitration. It is the purpose of the big nations, as shown by Article XV of the League of Nations, to refer to arbitration only such disputes as they see fit, reserving to themselves the power of their armaments to decide all others. This is why Article XV of the League creates an international court without any inherent jurisdiction at all. It is purely a consent court with the right of consent to jurisdiction to be given or withheld at the pleasure of any nation after the dispute has arisen. In short, it is no court at all.

(b) Another objection is that if the proposed international court is given affirmative jurisdiction to hear and determine disputes (which it has under the outlawry proposal) it must have the power to enforce its decrees. Particularly to a lawyer this seems at first to be necessary to the dignity and respect of any court. The international court must of course be given adequate power to enforce its judgments against all war criminals. The precise manner in which this may best be accomplished would be one of the important functions of the Codification Conference. But as to the civil decrees of the court a reading of the history of our constitutional debates will probably be persuasive if not convincing that force is not indispensable. When it was proposed to give the United States Supreme Court original jurisdiction over controversies between states, it was contended that the court should have the power to enforce its judgments in such cases as in all others. Madison, however, took the ground that to do so would be to destroy the sovereignty of the individual state, and would create anarchy, revolt and rebellion. He contended it was not proper to appoint a receiver for a state and that reliance must be placed on the consent of the states to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and on their

agreement to abide by its decisions. As great an authority as the late Senator Knox believed this to be a practical working model for the World Court. However, this question of enforcement is one to be settled by the learned delegates at the convention for the codification of international law. Much may be said in favor of an international force, or a force contributed to by various nations to aid in the execution of the international court's civil decrees as well as its criminal judgments. Whichever way this may be decided, it will not affect the reason for outlawing war.

It is probable that revolution cannot be altogether prevented. For if a nation is strong and mad enough to defy the world, either generally or in resistance to a decree of an international court, that is a risk that must be provided against, because it will always be inherent in any program. But revolutions, as we ordinarily view them, are domestic in character and therefore not within the scope of the theory of outlawry which deals only with controversies between nations. Any form of domestic violence whether arising through revolution, riots or otherwise, is subject to the control of intranational machinery and amenable to domestic law.

(c) Another objection is that some nation might plan to overrun the world while other nations were sleeping. The program of outlawry does not call for an abatement of armaments beyond the point of safety. Reduction of armaments is a world-wide economic necessity as well as a profound move toward peace; but the question of outlawry is one that can be considered entirely apart from the question of the size of the armaments necessary for each nation to protect itself against bad faith or disobedience to law or violation of contract or treaty rights. But when war becomes a crime armaments will subside.

(d) Still another objection is that outlawry of war cannot be established because of the essential difference between disputes among individuals and disputes between nations. Here, of course, the conception of sovereignty interposes itself. There has been considerable confusion of the two words "sovereignty" and "independence." A nation's independence must be maintained at all hazards; its sovereignty is "invaded" every time it makes a treaty or contract or puts a check upon its original unlimited power in any respect. Essentially, international disputes are the same as individual disputes in that they legitimately involve property or property rights and questions of liberty. Take the case of Alsace-Lorraine: After all, through the centuries, it was a controversy over real estate; a large amount of real estate to be sure, and involving, incidentally, a question of national allegiances; but inherently a question of title to real estate. In considering outlawry of war we must assume that disputes between nations are legitimate. If they are legitimate there ought to be a court that has the power to hear and determine such disputes under a code of law for the establishment of justice. If the controversies are illegitimate, that is, covers for conquest, they should not be allowed to provoke war and to spread destruction and death. After all, disputes will arise and they must get settled, if not by law and courts, then by violence and war. A sovereign nation that would set itself up above all the laws of justice in its dealings with other nations is unworthy to retain its sovereignty.

In any case, outlawry will reduce war to the level of piracy and duelling, and will prevent the education of another people to the blood and iron standard of "Deutschland Über Alles."

In connection with the foregoing obstacles and objections it should be borne in mind:

(a) That the international code when prepared must be submitted to each civilized nation and be by it approved. As each of such nations will participate in the preparation of the code general harmony may be expected. Besides it is also proposed that every five years the code may be amended and brought down to date, so that freshly discovered points may be covered.

(b) That the abolition of the institution of war by outlawry will tend to crystallize international public opinion in favor of peace, and to the branding of militarists as criminals. And if the nations of the world find that they are civilized enough to live under the reign of law in their international dealings, the economic salvage from the obsolete "court" of war will be colossal.

(c) That each nation shall disclose once a year the full nature of its armament, structural and chemical, new and old, and that these figures shall be verified by international committees. In this way substantially accurate knowledge of the preparation of each nation in the line of armament will be given to the others and secret preparation made abortive.

18. Outlawry of war is not intended as a panacea nor does it underwrite a millennium. It seeks to apply the tried and effective methods of civilization to international relations. It seeks to put a final end to the theory of force and violence for the determination of right in any human dispute. It does not claim that it will usher in the era of brotherly love nor create a United States of the World. It merely seeks to abolish the worst form of violence and crime existing among men.

Chicago, Ill. SALMON O. LEVINSON.

Some Recent Phases of the Peace Movement in Japan

Tokyo, November 18, 1921.

The appointment of Prince Tokugawa, President of the League of Nations Association, as one of the Plenipotentiary Ambassadors to the Washington Conference is significant. Other influential men active in the work of the Association who have gone to Washington are Viscount Shibusawa, Chairman; Dr. Soyeda, Vice-President; Messrs. Tagawa and Tayashi, Directors; and Mr. Sugimura, former General Secretary.

The Association is continuing its campaign for the Limitation of Armaments. A series of lectures was given in the Shikoku region in October. Appeals were sent to Buddhist and Christian organizations, to educational associations, to municipalities and to young men's associations, urging them to activity in the promotion of world peace through prayer, lectures and other means.

The various peace organizations of Japan have not yet been combined into one society, but the executive officers have met many times during the Autumn for the discussion of the Limitation of Armaments and the promotion of World Peace. Among the organizations thus co-operating are the League of Nations Association, the Japan Peace Society, the Disarmament Association, the Women's Peace Society, the

Japan Council of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, the New Women's Association, and the Association for the Protection of Education. This last organization represents unofficially the Imperial Educational Society, the Tokyo Educational Society and many local educational organizations in all parts of Japan. This Association owes its existence and activity to the threatened danger to national education arising from the large expenditure for military purposes. This combination of educators with allied peace organizations is most significant.

The step toward this combination of forces was the formation of the Association for the Investigation of Pacific Ocean Problems. Persons interested in this movement have sent resolutions to the Washington Conference. At the next meeting the Association for the Reduction of Armaments was established. Sixty persons attended the first meeting and one hundred twenty the second. At the last meeting, held in the Hall of the Tokyo Commercial University, all of the groups gave up their little differences and united for the reduction of armaments and the promotion of world peace.

To take charge of the various activities of this united group managers have been appointed and have already begun work. Lectures have already been given in several cities. The Union for Reduction of Armaments has established a section for the investigation of peace problems. There is talk of making this section independent. Since this union movement was organized the managers have often met with the executives of the various peace organizations for the discussion of methods of propaganda and the best means of utilizing the opportunities given by the Washington Conference.

The following program of work was approved though not completely carried out:

(1) The issue of posters relating to Pacificism and the Reduction of Armaments. One recent poster, used by different organizations (each inserting its own name on the lower part of posters used) is about two by three feet, the body of the poster contains the characters for "World Peace and Limitation of Armaments."

(2) The holding of frequent lecture meetings.

(3) Publication of pamphlets propaganda manifestos.

(4) Organizing demonstration for Reduction of Armaments.

(5) General meeting of pacifists on the evening of November 11.

(6) Observance of November 11 as "Peace Day," distributing flowers of peace and placards, through the help of children and ladies.

(7) Distributing in Japan and in America badges containing the words "Education First," the Education Association to act as distributor.

(8) Holding an exhibition of American pamphlets, leaflets and posters on peace.

(9) Purchasing in America moving picture peace film.

(10) Composition of peace songs for distribution to religious organizations.

(11) Joining in the movement to urge all churches to observe November 11 as a day of prayer for the success of the Washington Conference.

First Impressions of the News of Secretary Hughes' Announcement: With few exceptions the response in Japan to the bold announcement of the American proposals for Reduction of Armaments has been most cordial. The Tokyo *Jiji*, recognized as the best informed daily on naval affairs, as well as the most influential in the discussion of current issues, speaks in the warmest tones of Secretary Hughes' propositions. The element of surprise has made an excellent impression in Japan.

—*Contributed by David Starr Jordan.*

The World's Great Rebels and Heretics

II.

Amos the Farmer-Prophet.

God hates your religious feasts, and despises your pious assemblies. Take away from him the noise of your songs; he will not hear the melody of your religious music. But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.

Four hundred years from the day of Moses and the nation of the Hebrews had become a snug little nation, a sort of ancient Belgium. Jeroboam the Second was ruling, an ancient Louis XIV under whom luxury and prosperity walked side by side with oppression and want. The ethical religion of Moses had become an institution which was an ally of the king and sought to maintain the industrial *status quo*. Then comes up from the country a wandering farmer-herder. He flashes upon the people with a denunciation of all they hold dearest. But his message finds many sympathetic hearers; for several generations the prophets had been protesting against the priests, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Nathan, Gad and others had spoken out and had many followers who applauded the fearless tones of the new Rebel-Pleader. The moral force of the man made him so powerful that the king dared not lay hand on him. His power was like that of Tolstoy. The retained bishop goes forth and denounces the rebel; the king calls for his repudiation; but this rough-hewn man had the will of which rebels and martyrs are made; fierce and hot is his word that their sacred places are cruel, their religion a mockery, their priests hypocrites; he calls the haughty dames and matrons "the cows of Bashan"; he calls the business men "robbers and oppressors who stink."

Amos was not the large spirit like Isaiah, nor the educated man like Jeremiah, nor a sage like Daniel, nor such a powerful preacher as Hosea or Micah. He was of the common people—a peasant-rebel; hated, unpopular, he broke ground and led the way for that splendid line of spirits whom we call the Hebrew Prophets, and to whom the world owes so much. Had the lands of Germany and Austria had an Amos perhaps ten million boys now slain would be alive and happy.

Roland D. Sawyer.

AFTERWARDS.

When I am dead the day will dawn
As now it comes, when I am gone
The night will bring to others rest
As now the night for me is blessed,
All things will be as they are today
Except that I shall be . . . away.

James Waldo Fawcett.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

FREE THE POLITICAL PRISONERS!

Here are all the essential facts briefly and accurately put.

There are still in federal prisons today, three years after the Armistice, 145 men convicted under the Espionage Act and other war laws. There are 8 at Atlanta, 126 at Leavenworth, and 11 at McNeil's Island, Washington. All of them are radicals or pacifists—most of them members either of the Socialist Party or the Industrial Workers of the World, or of the Working Class Union (an organization among the tenant farmers of the Southwest). Most of them were working men in western industries—mining, lumber, agriculture—though there are over thirty tenant farmers among them, and a few professional men,—preachers, writers and organizers.

These prisoners are the last of the persons sentenced to prison under the Espionage Act and other war laws. Most of them are serving terms of from ten to twenty years. Unless special action is taken, it will be years before the last of these prisoners go free.

Their only offense was written or spoken opposition to the war—or language construed by the courts as opposed to the war. Some, like Eugene V. Debs, made public speeches against the war; others were convicted for remarks in private conversation. Still others, like the I. W. W., were convicted of conspiracies to obstruct the war merely by expressing opinions in the ordinary course of their correspondence and periodical publications.

Not one of the 145 still in prison was convicted of an act of violence against person or property. Not one was a German spy. The German enemy agents were released long ago. Every man now in prison was convicted *solely for expressing his opinions.* There is no possible distinction between them within that general classification. They are all "free speech" cases. Even in the I. W. W. conspiracy cases the appellate courts threw out all the charges which distinguished them from the ordinary "free speech" cases, leaving their offense only the expression of opinions. (Some exception to this might be taken in the peculiarities of the "silent defense" of the Sacramento case, but the essential facts are the same.) Therefore, they should all be released without discrimination. The present policy of the Department of Justice of dealing with each case on its merits is unjust, because it opens the way to playing favorites through political pressure or the personal prejudices of subordinate officials.

An act of general amnesty by the President or by Congress is the obvious means of meeting this situation squarely. That was the action taken twice during and after the Civil War, when all those Confederates who were imprisoned or who were subject to prosecution were freed and restored to full citizenship. That was the action taken by every foreign government associated with us in the war—and by the enemy countries, too. (Italy, Nov. 19, 1918; France, Oct. 24, 1919; Belgium, Oct. 31, 1919; Canada, Dec. 20, 1919.) In Great Britain there was no sentence of over six months for written or spoken opposition to the war, so the few in prison at the Armistice were shortly freed. There is not a single prisoner in any country associated with us in the war analogous to the 145 federal political prisoners still held in the United States.

Despite the fact that the Espionage Act was suspended March 3, 1921, and is now wholly inoperative, the government has not dismissed the cases brought under it. Only recently in St. Louis a man was sentenced to prison under it for the offense of having radical literature in his possession two years after the Armistice! There are scores of other cases pending in the courts. With an act of amnesty should go an order dismissing every prosecution under the Espionage Act and other war laws.

An act of amnesty might justly include those soldiers and sailors held in military prisons who were sentenced only for violations of military law—not for offenses under the criminal code. The injustices of our army court martial system, during the war particularly, are too well-known for comment. Acts of amnesty for political offenses usually include such military prisoners.

The following extracts from a letter to the President, presented by a number of citizens on November 18, 1921, states the whole case for amnesty:

"Freedom of expression is fundamental to the institutions of American liberty. Whatever may have been demanded by the exigencies of war, hostilities in fact ceased three years ago, treaties with our recent enemies have been ratified and peace has been formally proclaimed by you. There no longer exists the slightest justification for the continued incarceration of these men.

"Only in the United States are such political prisoners still confined. Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium and Canada have released offenders of this character. Adherence to our democratic traditions and ideals demand that we follow the example of our recent allies. The continued imprisonment of these men is a grave reflection upon our cherished freedom of expression and a reproach to our sense of justice, particularly since we long ago liberated active enemy agents, such as Von Rintelen and others, who bombed ships and committed crimes of the most serious nature.

"Those who believe that a general amnesty is an act of simple justice long overdue have waited patiently through the successive stages of the actual termination of hostilities, the passage of the Congressional resolution ending the war, the ratification of the peace treaties and your own formal proclamation of peace. We come to you confident that you will appreciate the fairness and wisdom of declaring an immediate general amnesty.

"It is particularly appropriate that you grant amnesty at this time. The passion of war has passed. The nations of the world are gathered in conference in the hope of ending war forever. These men in whose behalf we speak voiced in time of war sentiments which now are freely expressed. The truest traditions of our country call for their immediate release. We urge amnesty not only in behalf of these individuals, but in vindication of an everlasting principle."

The letter was signed by
William Allen White, of Emporia, Kan.
Father John A. Ryan,
of Washington, D. C.
Fred Hewitt,
of the International Association of Machinists
William F. Cochran
Rev. Mercer Green Johnston
Miss Elizabeth Gilman
Mrs. Mercer J. Johnston,
of Baltimore, Md.
Oswald Garrison Villard
Albert De Silver
Mrs. Emily Chadbourne
Herbert Croly, of New York City, N. Y.
George M. Lamont, of New Jersey
Rev. Beverly D. Tucker, Jr.,
of Virginia
Gen. W. H. Bixby,
of Washington, D. C.
John S. Codman, of Boston, Mass.
Miss Julia C. Lathrop
Mrs. Laura Williams
Mrs. Charles Edward Russell,
of Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Frances Lillie
Mrs. Walter Weyl, of New York City
Crane Gartz, of Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. Marguerite Tucker,
of San Francisco, Cal.
Mrs. Valentine Winters,
of Columbus, Ohio.

The demand for the freeing of political prisoners comes from all over the country, and from citizens of very different points of view. Practically the entire American labor movement has urged a general amnesty time and again—from the A. F. of L. in convention to the locals in the smallest communities. So, too, have various religious bodies, particularly the representative national organization of Protestantism, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Among ex-soldiers, the World War Veterans, and the Private Soldiers and Sailors Legion, have expressed themselves vigorously as organizations, as have a number of Congressional Medal of Honor men and Civil War veterans. Newspaper and magazine support is also wide-spread.

The only public opposition comes from the present dominant group in the American Legion, and a few reactionary or conservative newspapers.

An active campaign is being carried on at Washington under the auspices of the American Civil Liberties Union and cooperating organizations, with offices at 233 Maryland Building. The work is in charge of the following committee: Gilson Gardner, Chairman; Miss Mary Gertrude Fendall, Secretary; Henry Mussey, Rev. John A. Ryan, Wm. H. Johnston, Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, Alfred Klein, Walter Liggett, Laurence Todd, Vivian Pierce, Jackson H. Ralston, Basil M. Manly, Harry Slattery, Mrs. Robert M. La Follette, Frank P. Walsh and Mrs. Lillian Kisluick. This committee is part of the national organization of the American Civil Liberties Union with headquarters at 138 West 13th Street, New York, N. Y., of which the officers are: Harry F. Ward, New York, chairman; Duncan McDonald, Illinois, and Jeannette Rankin, Montana, vice-chairmen; Helen Phelps Stokes, New York, treasurer; Roger N. Baldwin, director; Albert De Silver, associate director.

Help is needed from every person who is for amnesty. Here's the way to give it:

1. Write the President, urging the immediate release of all federal political prisoners convicted under the Espionage Act and other war laws.
2. Write the Attorney-General, Harry M. Daugherty, also, if you can add that effort.
3. More important—write a brief letter to the editor of one of your local papers, calling attention to the issue, or better yet, go to see him and get him to write an editorial. Clip anything favorable and send it to address below for use in the campaign.
4. Contribute whatever you can to this final campaign to get these prisoners out and to restore some recognition of the principle of free speech.
5. If you are not on our mailing list, a postal to the address below will put you on.

Address all communications to

JOINT AMNESTY COMMITTEE
233 Maryland Building
Washington, D. C.

Subscribe for UNITY

—Do it Now!

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 221
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Jazz of Patriotism

An Anti-War Play

By FANNY BIXBY SPENCER

Published by
Geo. W. Moyle Pub. Co.
337 E. Third St., Long Beach, Calif.

Price 50 cents

Order from publisher or from
Fanny Bixby Spencer,
Costa Mesa, Orange Co., Calif.

Your book is altogether the most compelling and convicting exhibit of the unchristian character of the ordinary church reaction to war I have ever read. It is an invaluable contribution to the study of war hysteria. ROBERT WHITAKER.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO